arXiv:1701.00150v3 [math.RT] 10 Feb 2017

INJECTIVE STABILIZATION OF ADDITIVE FUNCTORS. I. PRELIMINARIES.

ALEX MARTSINKOVSKY AND JEREMY RUSSELL

Abstract. This paper is the first one in a series of three dealing with the concept of injective stabilization of the tensor product and its applications. Its primary goal is to collect known facts and establish a basic operational calculus that will be used in the subsequent parts. This is done in greater generality than is necessary for the stated goal. Several results of independent interest are also established. They include, among other things, connections with satellites, an explicit construction of the stabilization of a finitely presented functor, various exactness properties of the injectively stable functors, a construction, from a functor and a short exact sequence, of a doubly-infinite exact sequence splicing the injective stabilization of the functor and its derived functors. When specialized to the tensor product functor with a finitely presented module, the injective stabilization with coefficients in the ring is isomorphic to the 1-torsion functor. A generalization of a theorem of Eilenberg and Watts is proved. The Auslander-Reiten formula is extended to arbitrary (i.e., not necessarily finite) modules.

In the subsequent papers, applications of the developed techniques are given. Part 2 deals with new notions of torsion module and cotorsion module of a module. This is done for arbitrary modules over arbitrary rings. Part 3 introduces a new concept, called the asymptotic stabilization of the tensor product. The result is closely related to different variants of stable homology (these are generalizations of Tate homology to arbitrary rings). A comparison theorem is proved.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Motivation 3
3. Injective stabilization: definition and basic properties 4
4. Injective stabilization and (co)satellites 9
5. The injective stabilization of a finitely presented functor 12
6. Exactness properties of the injective stabilization 14
7. The injective stabilization of a right-exact functor 17
8. The injective stabilization of the tensor product 20
9. The small functor category and the colimit extension 22
References 27

Date: February 13, 2017, 1 h 54 min.

1. Introduction

This is the first in a series of three papers dealing with the notion of injective stabilization of an additive functor. Of primary interest to us are the univariate tensor products, but eventually we will have to branch out to include other functors as well. Originally, this paper was meant to be a short section with a list of basic preliminaries in what is now the third paper. However, at some point the authors realized that the short section is no longer short and the idea to split it off into a separate paper started to emerge. This decision was eventually reinforced by two additional arguments. The first one is related to the history of the subject, while the second one appeals to its future.

For the historical aspect, we remind the reader that the definition of the injective (and of the projective) stabilization of an additive functor was introduced by Auslander and Bridger in [3]. Shortly before that, Auslander had developed the language of coherent functors in his fundamental work [1]. One can arguably claim that most of what one needs to know to profit from categories of coherent functors is already contained in those two sources. Yet, at the same time, the results proved or mentioned there are not always easy to extract when needed for practical purposes. A decision then has been made, with a general reader in mind, to write up the preliminaries, with special attention to detail, in a separate paper while keeping it as self-contained as reasonably possible. As a result, this paper is aimed at a reader who is familiar with the notion of additive functor, but might not have worked with functor categories. Several results from [1] and [3] have been included (and streamlined), but a number of new results and examples have also been added.

The other argument for a separate paper is related to the direction of future research. For a long time, the first author has been calling for a study of stable categories. Most often this term refers to the category of modules modulo projectives. Its objects are modules, but the morphisms are quotients of the usual homomorphisms by the subgroup of homomorphisms factoring through projectives. This tool has numerous uses in diverse areas of representation theory, group cohomology, and topology (in fact, this concept originated the work of Eckmann and Hilton on duality in homotopy theory). But stable categories don't seem to have been studied for their own sake. The first attempt at a phenomenological study of categories modulo projectives has been recently undertaken in [14]. It became immediately clear that there were surprisingly tight and unexpected connections between the properties of the ring and the properties of its projectively stable category. Several years prior to that, the second author of the present paper – a graduate student at the time – had made a simple but incisive comment that Hom modulo projectives is actually the projective stabilization of the covariant Hom functor. Thus the reader with a flexible attitude may say that properties of the ring are reflected, often in unexpected ways, in the properties of the projective stabilization of the covariant Hom functor. What has transpired during the work on this series of papers, is that the same can be said about the injective stabilization of the tensor product (and the projective stabilization of the contravariant Hom functor). Two remarkable applications of this philosophy – the most general definitions of torsion and cotorsion modules of a module over an arbitrary ring – will be given in the second paper of the series. The first author is happy to admit that he was too timid in his call for study of stable categories. The new dictum should read "Study stable categories and stable functors". It is to be hoped that this paper will be of help to those

readers interested in functor categories who want to quickly start experimenting on their own.

We now give a brief outline of the contents of this paper. Motivation for the study of the injectively stabilized tensor product is provided in Section 2. Section 3 contains the definition and basic properties of the injective stabilization of an arbitrary additive functor, which leads to injectively stable functors. In the terminology of Grothendieck, these are precisely effaceable functors. They form the torsion class of a hereditary torsion theory on the functor category. The torsion-free class consists of the mono-preserving functors. In Section 4, we see a natural example of injectively stable functors, the right satellites. This is an important topic in its own right, primarily because the right and left satellites form an adjoint pair. They will reemerge in the third paper, but for now we record an important result: the injective stabilization of a half-exact functor is nothing but the counit of that adjunction. A new notion of cosatellite is also introduced there. The injective stabilization of a finitely presented (aka coherent) functor is investigated in Section 5. The defect of such a functor appears there, which leads to a 4-term exact sequence of fundamental importance. The injectively stable functors are precisely those with defect zero. Various exactness properties of the injective stabilization of a functor are described in Section 6. The injective stabilization of the tensor product and the harpoon notation for it make their first appearance there. Section 7 specializes to right-exact functors. In that case, the injective stabilization of the functor admits yet another description: this is the first right satellite of the first left derived functor of that functor. Given a short exact sequence of modules, the values of injective stabilization of a right- exact functor on the modules and their cosyzygy modules can be spliced together with the values of the left derived functors on the modules. The resulting sequence is doubly-infinite and exact. This sets up the stage for Section 8, where we look at the injective stabilization of the tensor product in more detail. This is actually a bifunctor. As is the case with the tensor product itself, its injective stabilization has an inert variable and an active variable (but no balance!). As was shown by Auslander, when the inert variable is finitely presented, the injective stabilization of the tensor product with the inert variable is isomorphic to the covariant Ext^1 of the transpose of that inert variable. When evaluated on the ring, this yields the 1-torsion (= Bass torsion) submodule of the inert variable. Section 9 exploits a remarkable property of additive functors defined on finitely presented modules – they all preserve filtered colimits – which allows to build an equivalence between the category of all functors on finitely presented modules and the category of functors on the entire module category which preserve colimits. This construction, called colimit extension, offers an alternative view on the functors on finitely presented modules. A simple application of this principle leads to a generalization of a theorem of Eilenberg and Watts. In a similar spirit, we extend the classical Auslander-Reiten formula to arbitrary (i.e., not necessarily finitely presented) modules.

2. Motivation

The starting point for this series of papers was the desire to find a `homological` counterpart to Buchweitz's generalization of Tate `cohomology` to arbitrary rings [5]. A solution to that problem will be presented in the third paper of the series. The

construction of Buchweitz is easy to describe:

$$\mathrm{B}^n(M,N) := \varinjlim_i \underline{\mathrm{Hom}}\,(\Omega^{i+n}M, \Omega^i N),$$

where $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}$ stands for Hom modulo projectives, and Ω indicates the syzygy operation (which is an endofunctor on the category of modules modulo projectives, which makes the right-hand side well-defined). To motivate our construction for a `homological` analog of $\mathrm{B}^n(M,N)$, we re-examine Buchweitz's definition from a different point of view. First, recall the notion of the `projective stabilization` of an additive functor. Let F be an additive functor from the category of modules over a ring to the category of abelian groups. Given a module M, let

$$P_1 \xrightarrow{\partial} P_0 \xrightarrow{\pi} M \longrightarrow 0$$

be a projective presentation of M. Applying F, define $L_0F := \operatorname{Coker} F(\partial)$. The cokernel of the canonical natural transformation $L_0F \longrightarrow F$ is called the `projective stabilization` of F and is denoted by $\underline{F}$. It is unique up to a canonical isomorphism and $\underline{F}(M) \cong \operatorname{Coker} F(\pi)$. In particular, if $F := (A, _)$ is the covariant Hom functor determined by the module A, then

$$\underline{F}(M) \cong \operatorname{Coker}\big((A,P_0) \longrightarrow (A,M)\big)$$

is precisely the component of the covariant Hom functor modulo projectives at M.

This point of view on Hom modulo projectives hints at a possible approach to constructing a homological counterpart of Buchweitz's version of stable cohomology: instead of computing the colimit of the projective stabilizations of the (covariant) Hom functors, one should compute the limit of the injective stabilizations of relevant tensor products. As in the cohomological setting, the choice of the resolutions is important: one of the variables will contribute a projective resolution, whereas the other – an injective one.

3. Injective stabilization: definition and basic properties

We begin by reviewing the notion of the injective stabilization of an additive (covariant) functor from the category of (say, left) modules over a ring Λ to the category of abelian groups (or, more generally, between two abelian categories, with the domain category having enough injectives). For an arbitrary module B, choose an injective copresentation

$$0 \longrightarrow B \xrightarrow{\iota} I^0 \xrightarrow{\partial} I^1 \tag{3.1}$$

and apply an additive functor F. Then the image of $F(\iota)$ is in $\operatorname{Ker} F(\partial) = R^0F(B)$, and one has a natural transformation $\rho_F : F \longrightarrow R^0F$.

Remark 3.1. It is well-known that R^0F is left-exact. Therefore, if ρ_F is an isomorphism, then F is left-exact. Conversely, if F is left-exact, then, as is also well-known, ρ_F is an isomorphism. Thus $\rho_F : F \longrightarrow R^0F$ is an isomorphism if and only if F is left-exact.

The kernel of ρ_F is called the `injective stabilization` of F and is denoted by $\overline{F}$. Thus we have an exact sequence of functors and natural transformations

$$0 \longrightarrow \overline{F} \longrightarrow F \xrightarrow{\rho_F} R^0F \tag{3.2}$$

It is immediate that $\overline{F}$, being a subfunctor of an additive functor, is itself additive.

Let

$$0 \longrightarrow B \xrightarrow{\iota'} I^{0'} \xrightarrow{\partial'} I^{1'} \tag{3.3}$$

be another injective copresentation of B. Lifting the identity map on B to injective resolutions extending the chosen presentations, we have a homotopy equivalence ε between the two. Since F is additive, $F(\varepsilon)$ is also a homotopy equivalence, and therefore the induced map $R^0F(B) \longrightarrow R^{0'}F(B)$ on the homology is an isomorphism. We now have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \overline{F}(B) & \longrightarrow & F(B) & \longrightarrow & R^0F(B) \\
 & & \vdots & & \| & & \downarrow \cong \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \overline{F}'(B) & \longrightarrow & F(B) & \longrightarrow & R^{0'}F(B)
\end{array}$$

where the dotted map is an isomorphism. Since the horizontal arrows into $F(B)$ are the inclusions of the underlying sets, the dotted isomorphism is in fact an equality. In other words, we have uniqueness in the strongest possible sense. In summary:

Lemma 3.2. *Any two choices for $\overline{F}(B)$ are equal. This equality is induced by any extension of the identity map on B to the two injective resolutions of B.* □

Remark 3.3. By definition, $\overline{F}(B)$ is an abelian group. If Γ is another ring and B is a Λ-Γ bimodule, then, since $\overline{F}$ is additive, $\overline{F}(B)$ is also a right Γ-module and the inclusion $\overline{F}(B) \to F(B)$ is a homomorphism of right Γ-modules.

The commutative diagram

(3.4)



of solid arrows, whose row, column, and diagonal are exact, shows that the dotted canonical map is an isomorphism, thereby providing a practical way of computing $\overline{F}(B)$. In particular, one does not need an injective copresentation of B – it suffices to have an embedding ι of B in an injective module. Whence

Lemma 3.4. *In the above notation, $\overline{F}(B) = \operatorname{Ker} F(\iota)$.* □

Example 3.5. Let $\Bbbk$ be a field of characteristic zero and $\Lambda := \Bbbk[[T]]$. Let $B := \Bbbk[[T]]/(T)$; as a Λ-module, this is just $\Bbbk$ with a trivial action of T. Let $I := \Bbbk[X]$, which we view as a Λ-module with $T \cdot f := df/dX$ for any $f \in I$. The inclusion $\iota : B \to I$ is clearly a homomorphism of Λ-modules. Moreover, this homomorphism is an essential extension – this follows from the fact that, since $\Bbbk$ is of characteristic zero, the last nonzero higher-order derivative of a polynomial is a constant. Using again the fact that $\operatorname{char} \Bbbk = 0$, it is not difficult to see that I is a divisible Λ-module,

and is therefore injective. As a result, $\iota : \Bbbk \to \Bbbk[X]$ is an injective envelope. Let A be a finitely generated Λ-module. We wish to compute $A \overrightarrow{\otimes} B = \operatorname{Ker}(A \otimes \iota)$. By the structure theorem for finitely generated modules over a PID, it suffices to assume that A is cyclic. If A is free, then $A \otimes _$ is an exact functor, and $A \overrightarrow{\otimes} B = \operatorname{Ker}(A \otimes \iota) = \{0\}$. Thus assume that A is not free, i.e., $A \simeq \Bbbk[[T]]/(T^n)$ for some $n \geq 1$. Now we need to compute the kernel of

$$\Bbbk[[T]]/(T^n) \otimes \Bbbk \longrightarrow \Bbbk[[T]]/(T^n) \otimes \Bbbk[X]$$

Notice that $\Bbbk[[T]]/(T^n) \otimes \Bbbk[X] \simeq \Bbbk[X]/(T^n)\Bbbk[X]$, which is a zero module since $\Bbbk[X]$ is divisible and therefore $(T^n)\Bbbk[X] = \Bbbk[X]$. It follows that $A \overrightarrow{\otimes} B \simeq \Bbbk$ for a cyclic A. For a general A, $A \overrightarrow{\otimes} B \simeq \Bbbk^s$, where s is the number of nonzero invariant factors of A.

The diagram (3.4) also yields

Lemma 3.6. *The injective stabilization of an additive functor vanishes on injectives.* □

Remark 3.7. The above lemma shows that there is no additive functor whose injective stabilization is isomorphic to a nonzero covariant Hom functor. Indeed, if M is a nonzero module, then $(M, _)$ is nonzero on the injective envelope of M, whereas any injective stabilization of a functor vanishes on it.

The injective stabilization of an additive functor can also be defined by an extremal property.

Proposition 3.8. *The injective stabilization of an additive functor F is the largest subfunctor of F vanishing on injectives.*

Proof. Let F be an additive functor. In view of Lemma 3.6, we only need to show that any subfunctor G of F vanishing on injectives is a subfunctor of $\overline{F}$. Applying F and G to the injective copresentation (3.1), we have a commutative diagram of solid arrows with exact rows

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \overline{G}(B) & \hookrightarrow & G(B) & \xrightarrow{G(\iota)} & G(I) \\ & & \vdots & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \overline{F}(B) & \hookrightarrow & F(B) & \xrightarrow{F(\iota)} & F(I) \end{array}$$

which induces a monic dotted arrow and thus shows that $\overline{G}$ is a subfunctor of $\overline{F}$. As $G(I) = \{0\}$, $G \simeq \overline{G}$, and therefore G is a subfunctor of $\overline{F}$. □

Now we want to discuss the question of "size" of $\overline{F}$. More precisely, we want to know when $\overline{F}$ is smallest or largest possible or, in other words, when $\overline{F} = 0$ or, respectively, $\overline{F} = F$. These possibilities are realized when $\rho_F : F \longrightarrow R^0F$ is monic or, respectively, the zero transformation.

Lemma 3.9. $\overline{F} = 0$ *if and only if F preserves monomorphisms.*

Proof. The "if" part is immediate. For the "only if" part, suppose $i : B \longrightarrow C$ is monic. Then $\iota : B \longrightarrow I^0$ extends over i, and therefore $F(\iota)$ extends over $F(i)$. By assumption, the former is monic, and therefore so is the latter. □

Corollary 3.10. *Let L be a right Λ-module. The injective stabilization of the functor $L \otimes _$ is zero if and only if L is flat.* □

Corollary 3.11. *For any Λ-module A, the injective stabilization of the covariant* Hom *functor $(A, _)$ is zero.* □

Corollary 3.12. *For any additive functor F, the injective stabilization of R^0F or of any of its subfunctors is zero. In particular, this holds for the image of the natural transformation $\rho_F : F \longrightarrow R^0F$.*

Proof. R^0F is left-exact and, in particular, preserves monomorphisms. Any subfunctor of such a functor also preserves monomorphisms. □

Now we look at the other extreme, when the inclusion $\overline{F} \longrightarrow F$ is an isomorphism, i.e., $\rho_F : F \longrightarrow R^0F$ is the zero transformation.

Definition 3.13. *The functor F is said to be* `injectively stable` *if the natural transformation $\overline{F} \longrightarrow F$ is an isomorphism.*

The next result is straightforward.

Proposition 3.14 ([3], Proposition 1.7)**.** *The following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) *F is injectively stable.*

(b) *$F(I) = 0$ for all injectives I.*

(c) *$R^0F = 0$.* □

Remark 3.15. Under our assumption that the domain category have enough injectives, Proposition 3.14 shows that injectively stable functors are precisely the *effaceable* functors of Grothendieck [10].

Example 3.16. For any Λ-module A, the functor $\mathrm{Ext}^1(A, _)$ is injectively stable.

Since $\overline{F}(I) \simeq 0$ whenever I is injective, we have

Corollary 3.17. *The injective stabilization of an additive functor is injectively stable.*

Proof. Follows from Lemma 3.6 and Proposition 3.14. □

We can now rephrase Proposition 3.8.

Corollary 3.18. *The injective stabilization of an additive functor is its largest injectively stable subfunctor.* □

As another consequence of Proposition 3.14, we have

Lemma 3.19. *Injectively stable functors form a Serre class, i.e., in a short exact sequence*[1] $0 \to F_1 \to F \to F_2 \to 0$ *of additive functors, F is injectively stable if and only if so are F_1 and F_2.*

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of the componentwise exactness of the sequence. □

[1]To avoid set-theoretic difficulties, exactness, as well as all other requisite concepts, will be understood in a componentwise sense.

The above observations lead to a torsion theory on the category of additive functors. For an additive functor F we have, in the notation of (3.2), an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \overline{F} \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow \operatorname{Im}\rho_F \longrightarrow 0$$

Recapping the above discussion, we have that $\overline{F}$ is injectively stable and $\operatorname{Im}\rho_F$ preserves monomorphisms. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be the class of injectively stable functors and $\mathcal{F}$ the class of mono-preserving functors.

Proposition 3.20. *$(\mathcal{T},\mathcal{F})$ is a hereditary torsion theory in the (quasi)category of additive functors.*

Proof. Clearly, $\mathcal{T}$ is closed under subobjects. In view of the above short exact sequence, we only need to show that any natural transformation $\alpha : T \to F$ from an injectively stable functor T to a mono-preserving functor F is zero. Notice that $\alpha(T)$, being a subfunctor of the mono-preserving functor F, is itself mono-preserving, and therefore, by Lemma 3.9, its injective stabilization is zero. On the other hand, Proposition 3.14 shows that, under any transformation, the image of an injectively stable functor is still injectively stable. Thus $\alpha(T)$, being equal to its own injective stabilization, must be zero. □

The foregoing argument leads to another useful characterization of injective stabilization.

Proposition 3.21. *Let F and F' be additive functors and suppose that F' is mono-preserving. If a natural transformation $\gamma : F \to F'$ evaluates to an isomorphism on each injective, then $\ker\gamma$ is the injective stabilization of F.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.8, we need to show that $\ker\gamma$ is the largest subfunctor of F vanishing on injectives. The vanishing property of $\ker\gamma$ follows immediately from the assumption. Now suppose that $i : G \hookrightarrow F$ is a subfunctor of F vanishing on injectives. By Proposition 3.20, the composition $\gamma i : G \longrightarrow F'$ is zero, and therefore i lifts over $\ker\gamma$. Since i is monic, so is the lifting, i.e., G is a subfunctor of $\ker\gamma$. □

Remark 3.22. The reader can rightfully expect that Proposition 3.20 and Proposition 3.21 have their analogs for the projective stabilization $\underline{F}$ of an additive functor F, which is defined by the exact sequence

$$L_0F \xrightarrow{\sigma_F} F \longrightarrow \underline{F} \longrightarrow 0.$$

This leads to a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \operatorname{Im}\sigma_F \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow \underline{F} \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $\operatorname{Im}\sigma_F$, being a quotient of the right-exact functor L_0F is epi-preserving. In fact, $\operatorname{Im}\sigma_F$ is the largest epi-preserving subfunctor of F. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be the class of epi-preserving functors and $\mathcal{F}$ the class of projectively stable functors. Then, similar to Proposition 3.20, we have that $(\mathcal{T},\mathcal{F})$ is a hereditary torsion theory in the (quasi)category of additive functors. Moreover, similar to Proposition 3.21, we have the following. Let F and F' be additive functors and suppose that F' is epi-preserving. If a natural transformation $\gamma : F' \to F$ evaluates to an isomorphism on each projective, then $\operatorname{coker}\gamma$ is the projective stabilization of F.

4. Injective stabilization and (co)satellites

Before making the next series of observations, we recall the definition of satellites [6]. Let $F : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ be an additive (covariant) functor between abelian categories and assume that $\mathcal{A}$ has enough projectives. The (first) left satellite S_1F of F is a functor $\mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ which is computed as follows. If A is an object of $\mathcal{A}$, choose a projective syzygy sequence $0 \to \Omega A \xrightarrow{\iota} P \to A \to 0$ of A and set $S_1F(A) := \operatorname{Ker} F(\iota)$. The values of S_1F on morphisms are defined in an obvious way, using liftings of maps along syzygy sequences. Higher-order left satellites S_nF of F are defined inductively. Thus left satellites vanish on projectives.

Right satellites of an additive functor are defined symmetrically. Again, let $F : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ be an additive (covariant) functor between abelian categories and assume that $\mathcal{A}$ has enough injectives. The (first) right satellite S^1F of F is a functor $\mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ which is computed as follows. If A is an object of $\mathcal{A}$, choose an injective cosyzygy sequence $0 \to A \to I \xrightarrow{\pi} \Sigma A \to 0$ and set $S^1F(A) := \operatorname{Coker} F(\pi)$. The values of S^1F on morphisms are defined in an obvious way, using extentions of maps along cosyzygy sequences. Higher-order right satellites S^nF of F are defined inductively. Thus right satellites vanish on injectives.

For now, we continue to assume that the domain category has enough injectives. Immediately from the definition of the left satellite and Proposition 3.14 we have

Corollary 4.1. *For any additive functor F and any integer $i \geq 1$, the iterated right satellite S^iF is injectively stable.* □

Embedding B in different injectives I and I', we have short exact sequences $0 \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow I \longrightarrow \Sigma B \longrightarrow 0$ and $0 \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow I' \longrightarrow \Sigma' B \longrightarrow 0$. Extending the identity map on B, we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & I & \longrightarrow & \Sigma B & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \| & & \downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \beta} & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & I' & \longrightarrow & \Sigma' B & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

By Schanuel's lemma, β is part of an isomorphism $\Sigma B \amalg I' \longrightarrow \Sigma' B \amalg I$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.6 and since $\overline{F}$ is additive, $\overline{F}(\beta)$ is an isomorphism. Moreover, any two choices for β differ by a map factoring through an injective and, therefore, $\overline{F}(\beta)$ does not depend on the extension of the identity map on B. As a consequence, we have

Lemma 4.2. *Any two choices for $\overline{F}(\Sigma B)$ are canonically isomorphic. The canonical isomorphism is determined by any extension of the identity map on B.* □

Using Proposition 3.14 and the definition of the right satellite, we can identify the group $\overline{F}(\Sigma B)$.

Lemma 4.3. *If F is an injectively stable functor, then $F(\Sigma_)$ is a functor and we have a canonical functor isomorphism $F(\Sigma_) \cong S^1F(_)$. As a consequence, for any additive functor F and any nonnegative integer i, we have a canonical functor isomorphism $F(\Sigma^i_) \cong S^iF(_)$.*

Proof. The desired isomorphism is an immediate consequence of the definition of the satellite and the fact that F vanishes on injectives. □

For the next two propositions we assume that the domain category $\mathcal{A}$ has enough injectives and projectives. In that case, the injective stabilization of a half-exact functor admits an alternative description. In [3], Auslander and Bridger show that if F is a half-exact functor, then $\overline{F} \simeq S^1 S_1 F$. Several years later, in [8], Fisher-Palmquist and Newell establish that the satellites (S^1, S_1) form an adjoint pair of endofunctors on the functor category. Let $c : S^1 S_1 \to 1$ be the counit of adjunction. In [3], Auslander and Bridger show that the assignment $F \mapsto \overline{F}$ is functorial and in fact is the right adjoint to the inclusion functor of the injectively stable functors into the functor category, with the counit of adjunction evaluated on F being the inclusion $\alpha_F : \overline{F} \to F$. Combining these results we have

Proposition 4.4. *If F is half-exact, then the F-component $c_F : S^1 S_1 F \to F$ of the counit of adjunction c is isomorphic to the inclusion $\overline{F} \longrightarrow F$.*

Proof. We have a commutative diagram with exact rows



where

(1) θ is induced by the universal property of the counit of adjunction α_F and the fact that $S^1 S_1 F$ is injectively stable.
(2) φ is induced by the universal property of the counit of adjunction c_F and the fact that $\overline{F} \simeq S^1 S_1 F$ because F is half-exact.

Thus $c_F \varphi \theta = c_F$ and $\alpha_F \theta \varphi = \alpha_F$. By the universal property of counits, $\varphi\theta = 1$ and $\theta\varphi = 1$, which is the desired claim. □

In the case when F is not half-exact, we can only claim that the counit of adjunction factors through the injective stabilization. More precisely, we have

Proposition 4.5. *For any functor F there is a commutative diagram with exact rows and columns*



Proof. The functor S^1S_1F is injectively stable and hence, by the universal property of the counit α_F, one has the morphism θ and the induced morphism γ_F. By the exactness of the two middle rows, γ_F is an isomorphism on injectives. By Proposition 3.21, $\overline{\mathrm{Coker}\,(c_F)}$ is the kernel of γ_F. By the snake lemma, $\overline{\mathrm{Coker}\,(c_F)}$ is the cokernel of θ. □

We now introduce a new concept, that of the `cosatellites`. Let $F : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ be an additive covariant functor between abelian categories. Assuming that $\mathcal{A}$ has enough projectives, choose a projective syzygy sequence $0 \to \Omega A \xrightarrow{\iota} P \to A \to 0$ for each object A of $\mathcal{A}$. The left cosatellite C_1F of F is the functor $\mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ whose value on A is defined by $C_1F(A) := \mathrm{Coker}\, F(\iota)$. The values on morphisms are defined in an obvious way.

Next, instead of assuming that $\mathcal{A}$ has enough projectives, assume that $\mathcal{A}$ has enough injectives. Choose an injective cosyzygy sequence $0 \to A \to I \xrightarrow{\pi} \Sigma A \to 0$ for each object A of $\mathcal{A}$. The right cosatellite C^1F of F is the functor $\mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ whose value on A is defined by $C^1F(A) := \mathrm{Ker}\, F(\pi)$. The values on morphisms are defined in an obvious way.

If F is a contravariant functor, then the left cosatellite C_1F is defined by $C_1F(A) := \mathrm{Coker}\, F(\pi)$ and the right cosatellite C^1F is defined by $C^1F(A) := \mathrm{Ker}\, F(\iota)$.

In keeping with the philosophy of [3], we investigate some properties of cosatellites related to injective stabilization. Just as the satellites determine the injective stabilization of a half-exact functor, the right cosatellite determines the image of the unit of adjunction $F \to R^0F$ for a half-exact functor.

Proposition 4.6. *Suppose that $F : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ is a half-exact functor. Then C^1F is the image of $\rho_F : F \to R^0F$.*

Proof. From the cosyzygy sequence $0 \to A \xrightarrow{\iota} I \xrightarrow{\pi} \Sigma A \to 0$, using the fact that F is half-exact and applying Lemma 3.4 yields the exact sequence

$$0 \to \overline{F}(A) \to F(A) \overset{F(\iota)}{\to} F(I) \overset{F(\pi)}{\to} F(\Sigma A)$$

From the short exact sequence

$$0 \to \overline{F}(A) \to F(A) \to \operatorname{Im} \rho_F(A) \to 0$$

it follows that $C^1F(A) = \operatorname{Ker} F(\pi)(A) \simeq \operatorname{Im} \rho_F(A)$ which is easily seen to be natural in A. Hence $C^1F \simeq \operatorname{Im} \rho_F$. □

One has the dual result for the natural transformation $L_0F \to F$ when F is half-exact. Namely, for any half-exact functor F, the left cosatellite C_1F is isomorphic to the image of the morphism $L_0F \to F$.

5. The injective stabilization of a finitely presented functor

In this section we shall review results from [1](see Sections 3 and 4) that allow to produce an explicit projective resolution of the injective stabilization of a finitely presented functor.

Recall that the functor F is `finitely presented` if is isomorphic to a cokernel of a natural transformation between representable functors. In other words, there is a morphism $f : A \longrightarrow B$ in the domain category and an exact sequence

$$(B, _) \xrightarrow{(f,_)} (A, _) \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow 0$$

Of interest to us is the *defect* of F, which is defined as $\operatorname{Ker} f$ and denoted by $w(F)$.[2] Thus we have an exact sequence

(5.1)
$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & w(F) & \xrightarrow{l} & A & \xrightarrow{f} & B & \longrightarrow & C \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & & & & \searrow^{p} \quad \nearrow_{i} & & & \\ & & & & & \operatorname{Im} f & & & \end{array}$$

[2]For the original definition and a more detailed study of the defect, see [1]. Notice that the term "defect" is not used there. For further properties and applications of the defect, see [17].

where (p, i) is the epi-mono factorization of f and $C := \operatorname{Coker} f$. Associated with this sequence we have a diagram of solid arrows

(5.2)



where:

- $F_0 := \operatorname{Coker}(i, _)$;
- $\nu : F_0 \to F_1$ is the induced map on the cokernels;
- $F_1 := \operatorname{Coker}(l, _)$.

Since the top two rows are exact, the square T is both a pullback and a pushout. In particular, the induced map $\nu : F_0 \to F$ is monic. Furthermore, by the pushout property of the square, the induced map between the cokernels of $(p, -)$ and ν is an isomorphism. Pushing that map along the monomorphism part of the epi-mono factorization of $(l, _)$, we define $\mu : F \longrightarrow (w(F), _)$ as the composition of the cokernel of ν and the arrow parallel to the aforementioned monomorphism. Since an arrow parallel to an isomorphism is an isomorphism, we have the bottom isomorphism in the square M. Passing to the cokernels, we have the isomorphism on the bottom of the diagram. As a result, we have a commutative diagram with exact rows and columns.

Since the contravariant Hom functor into an injective is exact, both F_0 and F_1 vanish on injectives and are therefore injectively stable. Moreover, since the kernel and the cokernel of any natural transformation between finitely presented functors are finitely presented ([2, Proposition 3.1]), both F_0 and F_1 are finitely presented.

In [1], Auslander argues[3] that $\big(w(F), _\big) \cong R^0 F$ for any finitely presented functor F, and that the morphism $\mu : F \to \big(w(F), _\big)$ from (5.2) is the canonical morphism $F \to R^0 F$. As a result, we have

Proposition 5.1. *Let F be a finitely presented functor. Then:*

(1) $\overline{F} = F_0$;
(2) *F is injectively stable if and only if it has zero defect;*

[3] See the argument at the bottom of page 209 and the beginning of page 210.

(3) *given a presentation*

$$(B, _) \xrightarrow{(f,_)} (A, _) \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow 0,$$

$\overline{F} = F_0$ *has a projective resolution*

$$0 \longrightarrow (C, -) \longrightarrow (B, _) \xrightarrow{(i,_)} (\operatorname{Im} f, _) \longrightarrow F_0 \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $C := \operatorname{Coker} f$ *and* i *is the monic part of the epi-mono factorization* (p, i) *of* $f : A \to B$*;*

(4) *the exact sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow w(F) \xrightarrow{l} A \xrightarrow{p} \operatorname{Im} f \longrightarrow 0$$

gives rise to a projective resolution of F_1*:*

$$0 \longrightarrow (\operatorname{Im} f, -) \xrightarrow{(p,-)} (A, -) \xrightarrow{(l,-)} (w(F), -) \longrightarrow F_1 \longrightarrow 0$$

6. Exactness properties of the injective stabilization

In this subsection we shall examine various exactness properties of the injective stabilization.

The following result was proved in [3] under the assumption that, in addition to enough injectives, the domain category has enough projectives. The elementary proof below shows that that additional assumption is not needed.

Proposition 6.1. *The injective stabilization of a half-exact functor is half-exact.*

Proof. Let $0 \to A \to B \to C \to 0$ be exact. Applying the horse-shoe lemma to injective containers of A and C, followed by F results in a commutative diagram with exact bottom two rows and columns:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & \overline{F}(A) & \longrightarrow & \overline{F}(B) & \longrightarrow & \overline{F}(C) \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & F(A) & \longrightarrow & F(B) & \longrightarrow & F(C) \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
0 & \longrightarrow & F(I') & \longrightarrow & F(I) & \longrightarrow & F(I'') & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}$$

The exactness of the top row now follows from a simple diagram chase. □

We can also characterize those functors whose injective stabilization is left-exact.

Proposition 6.2. *Let* F *be an additive functor. The following conditions are equivalent.*

(1) $\overline{F}$ *is left-exact;*
(2) $\overline{F} = 0$*;*
(3) F *preserves monomorphisms.*

Proof. Suppose $\overline{F}$ is left-exact. For an arbitrary object L choose an injective container $\iota : L \longrightarrow I$ and apply $\overline{F}$. Then $\overline{F}(\iota)$ is monic but, by Proposition 3.14, $\overline{F}(I) = \{0\}$. Hence $\overline{F}(L) = \{0\}$. The converse is trivial. The equivalence of the last two conditions was established in Lemma 3.9. □

Let Λ be a ring and A a right Λ-module. The injective stabilization of the functor $A \otimes _$ will be denoted by $A \overrightarrow{\otimes} _$. Thus $A \overrightarrow{\otimes} B = (A \overrightarrow{\otimes} _)(B)$. In this context, A will be said to be the `inert` variable, and B will be referred to as the `active` variable. In other words, the active variable is the one being injectively resolved. In the new notation the harpoon always points to the active variable and thus $A \overrightarrow{\otimes} B$ will not be confused with $A \overleftarrow{\otimes} B$.

Specializing Proposition 6.2 to the case of the tensor product, we have

Proposition 6.3. *The functor $A \overrightarrow{\otimes} _$ is left-exact if and only if A is flat. In that case $A \overrightarrow{\otimes} _ = 0$.* □

Next we want to investigate the question of when the injective stabilization of an additive functor is right-exact. The following example shows that, in general, the injective stabilization of an additive functor need not even preserve epimorphisms.

Example 6.4. Let $\Bbbk$ be a field, $\Lambda := \Bbbk[x]/(x^2)$, and $F := \Bbbk \otimes _$. Then Λ is self-injective and therefore $\overline{F}(\Lambda) = \{0\}$. The short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \Bbbk \longrightarrow \Lambda \longrightarrow \Bbbk \longrightarrow 0$$

gives us an epimorphism $\pi : \Lambda \longrightarrow \Bbbk$ and we claim that $\overline{F}(\pi)$ is not an epimorphism, i.e., $\overline{F}(\Bbbk) \neq \{0\}$. To compute $\overline{F}(\Bbbk)$, we use the same short exact sequence, which also gives us the injective envelope $\iota : \Bbbk \longrightarrow \Lambda$. Tensoring it with $\Bbbk$, we have an exact sequence

$$\Bbbk \xrightarrow{1\otimes\iota} \Bbbk \xrightarrow{1\otimes\pi} \Bbbk \longrightarrow 0$$

where $1 \otimes \pi$ is an isomorphism by the right-exactness of the tensor product. This forces $1 \otimes \iota = 0$, showing that $\overline{F}(\Bbbk) \simeq \Bbbk$. Thus $\overline{F}(\pi) : 0 \to \Bbbk$ is not epic and therefore $\overline{F}$ is not right-exact.

To deal with this kind of obstruction, we introduce

Definition 6.5. *Let $F : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be an additive functor between abelian categories, where $\mathcal{C}$ has enough injectives. We say that an object $C \in \mathcal{C}$ has property `A` (with respect to F) if $F(i)$ is a monomorphism whenever i is a monomorphism with domain C.*

Remark 6.6. If $\mathcal{C}$ is a module category and C has property `A` with respect to each tensor product functor, then C is said to be absolutely pure ([13]) or FP-injective ([18]).

Trivially, any injective object has property `A`.

Lemma 6.7. *Under the above assumptions, C has property `A` if and only if $F(i) : F(C) \to F(J)$ is a monomorphism for each monomorphism $i : C \to J$ with J injective.*

Proof. The "only if" part is immediate from the definition. For the other direction, use the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.9.[4] □

[4]Clearly, it suffices to check the preservation property for a single injective container of C.

Proposition 6.8. *Under the above assumptions, suppose that $\overline{F}$ preserves epimorphisms. Then all cosyzygy objects (i.e., homomorphic images of injectives[5]) have property* `A` *with respect to F.*

Proof. Given an arbitrary object C, let $0 \to C \to I \xrightarrow{p} \Sigma C \to 0$ be exact with C injective. Applying $\overline{F}$, we have that $\overline{F}(p)$ is epic and $\overline{F}(I) = (0)$, showing that $\overline{F}(\Sigma C) = (0)$. In other words, the kernel of $F(i) : F(\Sigma C) \to F(J)$ is zero for any injective container $i : \Sigma C \to J$. By Lemma 6.7, ΣC has property `A`. □

Now we want to show that if F is right-exact, then the converse of the previous result holds. More precisely, we have

Theorem 6.9. *Let $F : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a right-exact (hence additive) functor between abelian categories, where $\mathcal{C}$ has enough injectives. Then $\overline{F}$ is right-exact if and only if all syzygy objects in $\mathcal{C}$ have property* `A` *with respect to F.*

Proof. The "only if" part is Proposition 6.8. Conversely, assume that property `A` holds for all cosyzygy modules. By Proposition 6.1, $\overline{F}$ is half-exact. Thus we only need to show that $\overline{F}$ preserves epimorphisms. Let

$$0 \longrightarrow L \xrightarrow{i} M \xrightarrow{p} N \longrightarrow 0$$

be a short exact sequence. We need to show that $\overline{F}(p)$ is epic. Taking cosyzygy sequences for the end terms and using the horse-shoe lemma, we have a 3×3 commutative diagram with exact rows and columns, whose middle row is split-exact. Applying F and using its right-exactness, we have another commutative diagram with exact rows and columns:

(6.1)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 & & \overline{F}(L) & \longrightarrow & \overline{F}(M) & \xrightarrow{\overline{F}(p)} & \overline{F}(N) & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & F(L) & \longrightarrow & F(M) & \longrightarrow & F(N) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & F(I') & \longrightarrow & F(I) & \longrightarrow & F(I'') & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & F(\Sigma L) & \longrightarrow & F(\Sigma M) & \longrightarrow & F(\Sigma N) & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}$$

The snake lemma yields an exact sequence

$$\overline{F}(M) \xrightarrow{\overline{F}(p)} \overline{F}(N) \xrightarrow{\delta} F(\Sigma L) \xrightarrow{F(\Sigma i)} F(\Sigma M)$$

where δ is the connecting homomorphism. By the assumption, $F(\Sigma i)$ is monic, making δ the zero map and $\overline{F}(p)$ epic. □

Specializing to the case when F is the tensor product with a right Λ module A, we denote its injective stabilization by $A \overrightarrow{\otimes} _$. We can give a criterion for Λ to have the property that the functor $A \overrightarrow{\otimes} _$ is right-exact `for any` right Λ-module A.

[5]For modules over a commutative domain with this property, Matlis [15] uses the term *h*-`divisible`. In [9], the same terminology is used for modules over arbitrary rings.

Theorem 6.10. *The functor $A \overrightarrow{\otimes} _$ is right-exact for any right Λ-module A if and only if the class of all cosyzygy modules of left Λ-modules has property* **A**. □

Remark 6.11. In the terminology of [15] and [18], the last result reads as follows: the functor $A \overrightarrow{\otimes} _$ is right-exact for any right Λ-module A if and only if all h-divisible modules are FP-injective. Concerning the terminology, see Remark 6.6 and the footnote to Proposition 6.8.

Corollary 6.12. *If Λ is left (resp., right) semihereditary, then $A \overrightarrow{\otimes} _$ (resp., $_ \overleftarrow{\otimes} A$) is right-exact for any right (resp., left) Λ-module A.*

Proof. By [16, Theorem 2], a ring is semihereditary if and only if any homomorphic image of an FP-injective is FP-injective. Since injectives are clearly FP-injective, any h-divisible module is FP-injective. □

7. The injective stabilization of a right-exact functor

In this section, we assume that the domain category has enough injectives and projectives. Let $F : \Lambda\text{-Mod} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ab}$ be a right-exact functor. Thus F is automatically additive.

Applying F to the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow I \longrightarrow \Sigma B \longrightarrow 0$$

with an injective I and passing to the corresponding long homology exact sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} \ldots & \longrightarrow & L_1F(I) & \longrightarrow & L_1F(\Sigma B) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & F(B) & \longrightarrow & F(I) \longrightarrow \ldots \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \uparrow & & \\ & & & & S^1L_1F(B) & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \overline{F}(B) & & \end{array} \tag{7.1}$$

we have a canonical isomorphism $S^1L_1F(B) \longrightarrow \overline{F}(B)$ induced by the connecting homomorphism δ.[6] As a result, in the case of a right-exact functor F, we have yet another description of the injective stabilization.

Lemma 7.1. *For a right-exact functor F, the connecting homomorphism δ in (7.1) induces a functor isomorphism $S^1(L_1F) \simeq \overline{F}$.*

Proof. The componentwise isomorphisms have just been constructed. The naturality follows from the naturality of δ and from a trivial diagram chase. □

Remark 7.2. Let

$$0 \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow I' \longrightarrow \Sigma' B \longrightarrow 0$$

be an embedding of B in another injective I'. Extending the identity map on B to a map of the corresponding short exact sequences and using the just proved naturality, we have a commutative diagram of isomorphisms

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S^1L_1F(B) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \overline{F}(B) \\ \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong \\ S^{1'}L_1F(B) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \overline{F}'(B) \end{array}$$

[6] We assume that δ is chosen canonically, as in the classical proof of the snake lemma.

Colloquially, we shall simply say that the isomorphism of Lemma 7.1 is determined uniquely up to a canonical isomorphism.

Suppose that

$$0 \longrightarrow B' \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow B'' \longrightarrow 0$$

is an exact sequence of left Λ-modules. We want to construct a long exact sequence associated with it and with the injective stabilization of F.

Choose injective resolutions I' of B' and I'' of B'', and using the horse-shoe lemma, build an injective resolution of B. Passing to the first cosyzygy modules and applying the functor F to the resulting 3×3 square with exact rows and columns, we have, because F is right-exact, another commutative diagram with exact rows and columns

(7.2)
$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 & & \overline{F}(B') & \longrightarrow & \overline{F}(B) & \longrightarrow & \overline{F}(B'') & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & F(B') & \longrightarrow & F(B) & \longrightarrow & F(B'') & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & F(I^{0'}) & \longrightarrow & F(I^0) & \longrightarrow & F(I^{0''}) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & F(\Sigma B') & \longrightarrow & F(\Sigma B) & \longrightarrow & F(\Sigma B'') & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}$$

whose second-from-the-bottom row is split-exact by the additivity of F. The snake lemma gives rise to an exact sequence

$$\overline{F}(B') \longrightarrow \overline{F}(B) \longrightarrow \overline{F}(B'') \longrightarrow F(\Sigma B') \longrightarrow F(\Sigma B) \longrightarrow F(\Sigma B'')$$

The same argument applied to the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \Sigma B' \longrightarrow \Sigma B \longrightarrow \Sigma B'' \longrightarrow 0$$

yields a similar diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 & & \overline{F}(\Sigma B') & \longrightarrow & \overline{F}(\Sigma B) & \longrightarrow & \overline{F}(\Sigma B'') & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & F(\Sigma B') & \longrightarrow & F(\Sigma B) & \longrightarrow & F(\Sigma B'') & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & S & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & F(I^{1'}) & \longrightarrow & F(I^1) & \longrightarrow & F(I^{1''}) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & F(\Sigma^2 B') & \longrightarrow & F(\Sigma^2 B) & \longrightarrow & F(\Sigma^2 B'') & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}$$

and an exact sequence

$$\overline{F}(\Sigma B') \longrightarrow \overline{F}(\Sigma B) \longrightarrow \overline{F}(\Sigma B'') \longrightarrow F(\Sigma^2 B') \longrightarrow F(\Sigma^2 B) \longrightarrow F(\Sigma^2 B'')$$

Taking into account that the square S is commutative and its bottom map is monic, we have that the connecting homomorphism in the previous diagram has its image

in $\overline{F}(\Sigma B')$, and thus gives rise to a homomorphism $\delta : \overline{F}(B'') \longrightarrow \overline{F}(\Sigma B')$. It is easy to see that, as a result, we have an exact sequence

$$\overline{F}(B') \longrightarrow \overline{F}(B) \longrightarrow \overline{F}(B'') \xrightarrow{\delta} \overline{F}(\Sigma B') \longrightarrow \overline{F}(\Sigma B) \longrightarrow \overline{F}(\Sigma B'')$$

Moreover, iterating the above procedure, we have

Lemma 7.3. *The just constructed sequence of injective stabilizations*

$$\overline{F}(B') \longrightarrow \overline{F}(B) \longrightarrow \ldots \longrightarrow \overline{F}(\Sigma^i B'') \xrightarrow{\delta} \overline{F}(\Sigma^{i+1} B') \longrightarrow \overline{F}(\Sigma^{i+1} B) \longrightarrow \ldots$$

is exact and is natural with respect to morphisms of short exact sequences.

Proof. The first assertion has already been established; the second follows from the functoriality of the injective stabilization and the naturality of the connecting homomorphism. □

Proposition 7.4. *The injective stabilization of a right-exact functor is half-exact. If, in addition, the ring is hereditary, then the injective stabilization of the functor is also right-exact.*

Proof. The first claim follows from Lemma 7.3. To prove the second claim, notice that first syzygy modules are injective and therefore the bottom row of the diagram (7.2) is a split short exact sequence, making the connecting homomorphism a zero map. □

Now we want to extend the sequence from Lemma 7.3 to the left so that the resulting doubly-infinite sequence be exact. To this end, we again apply F to the short exact sequence $0 \to B' \to B \to B'' \to 0$. This yields the familiar exact sequence

$$L_1F(B') \to L_1F(B) \to L_1F(B'') \xrightarrow{\delta} F(B') \xrightarrow{\beta} F(B) \to F(B'') \to 0$$

which extends on the left to the long exact sequence of the corresponding left derived functors of F. On the other hand, the last three terms of this sequence are part of the commutative diagram (7.2) with exact rows and columns. Taking into account that the map $F(I^{0'}) \longrightarrow F(I^0)$ in that diagram is monic, we have that the image of the connecting homomorphism $\delta : L_1F(B'') \to F(B')$ is in $\overline{F}(B')$, which yields a sequence

$$L_1F(B') \longrightarrow L_1F(B) \longrightarrow L_1F(B'') \xrightarrow{\delta'} \overline{F}(B') \xrightarrow{\beta'} \overline{F}(B) \longrightarrow \overline{F}(B'')$$

It is clear that this sequence is a complex and that it is exact, except possibly at $\overline{F}(B')$. On the other hand, $\operatorname{Ker}\beta' \subset \operatorname{Ker}\beta = \operatorname{Im}\delta = \operatorname{Im}\delta'$ (the last three terms are *equal*, not just isomorphic) and therefore we have the exactness at $\overline{F}(B')$, too. We have thus proved

Proposition 7.5. *Given a right-exact functor F from (left or right) Λ-modules to abelian groups and a short exact sequence $0 \to B' \to B \to B'' \to 0$ of (left or right)*

modules, the foregoing constructions yield a doubly-infinite exact sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\dots & \longrightarrow & L_iF(B') & \longrightarrow & L_iF(B) & \longrightarrow & L_iF(B'') \\
 & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\
\dots & \longrightarrow & L_1F(B') & \longrightarrow & L_1F(B) & \longrightarrow & L_1F(B'') \\
 & \longrightarrow & \overline{F}(B') & \longrightarrow & \overline{F}(B) & \longrightarrow & \overline{F}(B'') \\
 & \longrightarrow & \overline{F}(\Sigma B') & \longrightarrow & \overline{F}(\Sigma B) & \longrightarrow & \overline{F}(\Sigma B'') \\
 & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\
\dots & \longrightarrow & \overline{F}(\Sigma^j B') & \longrightarrow & \overline{F}(\Sigma^j B) & \longrightarrow & \overline{F}(\Sigma^j B'') & \longrightarrow & \dots
\end{array}$$

□

8. The injective stabilization of the tensor product

Now we specialize to the case when F is a univariate tensor product on a module category. More precisely, given a ring Λ and a right Λ-module A, we are interested in the injective stabilization $A \mathbin{\overrightarrow{\otimes}} _$ of the functor $A \otimes _ : \Lambda\text{-Mod} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ab}$. (See p. 15 for notation.)

If P is a projective right module then, by Corollary 3.10, $P \mathbin{\overrightarrow{\otimes}} _$ is a zero functor. This, together with Schanuel's lemma, yields

Lemma 8.1. *The operation $\Omega A \mathbin{\overrightarrow{\otimes}} _$, where ΩA denotes a first syzygy module of A, is a functor. It is determined uniquely up to a canonical isomorphism, regardless of the choice of the projective resolution of A. The canonical isomorphism is induced by any comparison map between the projective resolutions of A.* □

Similarly, specializing Lemma 4.2 to $F := A \otimes _$, we have

Lemma 8.2. *The operation $A \mathbin{\overrightarrow{\otimes}} \Sigma _$, where Σ denotes a cosyzygy operation on left Λ-modules in injective resolutions, is a functor. It is determined uniquely up to a canonical isomorphism, which is induced by any comparison map between the injective resolutions of the blank argument.* □

Specializing (7.1) and Lemma 7.1 to the case $F = A \otimes _$, where A is a right Λ-module, we have

Proposition 8.3. *The connecting homomorphism $\mathrm{Tor}_1(A, \Sigma B) \longrightarrow A \otimes B$ induces a functor isomorphism $S^1\mathrm{Tor}_1(A, _) \simeq A \mathbin{\overrightarrow{\otimes}} _$, natural in A.*[7] □

[7] The reader who does not have prior experience in dealing with functors should notice that, when evaluating the left-hand side of the last isomorphism on the module B, one cannot replace the blank with B – the resulting expression $S^1\mathrm{Tor}_1(A, B)$ would be meaningless. Instead, it is useful to think of S^1 as a derivative, and follow the freshman calculus rule to compute the derivative first and then evaluate it at a specific value of the argument.

Specializing Proposition 7.5 to the case $F := A \otimes _$, where A is a right Λ-module, and a short exact sequence $0 \to B' \to B \to B'' \to 0$ of left modules, we have a doubly-infinite exact sequence

$$
\begin{array}{ccccc}
\ldots & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Tor}_i(A,B') & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Tor}_i(A,B) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Tor}_i(A,B'') \\
 & & \vdots & & \vdots \qquad\quad \vdots \\
\ldots & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Tor}_1(A,B') & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Tor}_1(A,B) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Tor}_1(A,B'') \\
 & \longrightarrow & A \overset{\frown}{\otimes} B' & \longrightarrow & A \overset{\frown}{\otimes} B \longrightarrow A \overset{\frown}{\otimes} B'' \\
 & \longrightarrow & A \overset{\frown}{\otimes} \Sigma B' & \longrightarrow & A \overset{\frown}{\otimes} \Sigma B \longrightarrow A \overset{\frown}{\otimes} \Sigma B'' \\
 & & \vdots & & \vdots \qquad\quad \vdots \\
\ldots & \longrightarrow & A \overset{\frown}{\otimes} \Sigma^j B' & \longrightarrow & A \overset{\frown}{\otimes} \Sigma^j B \longrightarrow A \overset{\frown}{\otimes} \Sigma^j B'' \longrightarrow \ldots
\end{array}
\tag{8.1}
$$

Finally, we want to evaluate the functor $A \overset{\frown}{\otimes} _$, where A is a right Λ-module, on the bimodule Λ. Thus $A \overset{\frown}{\otimes} \Lambda$ is a submodule of $A \otimes \Lambda \cong A$. If A is finitely presented, this module can be determined explicitly. To this end, we specialize Proposition 5.1 to the Λ-component. Let $P_1 \xrightarrow{\partial} P_0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow 0$ be a finite presentation of A. This yields a finite presentation of the functor $A \otimes _$:

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
P_1 \otimes _ & \xrightarrow{(\partial \otimes _)} & P_0 \otimes _ & \longrightarrow & A \otimes _ & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\| & & \| & & \| & & \\
(P_1^*, _) & \xrightarrow{(\partial^*, _)} & (P_0^*, _) & \longrightarrow & A \otimes _ & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}
$$

This, in turn, yields the corresponding defect sequence

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & A^* & \xrightarrow{l} & P_0^* & \xrightarrow{\qquad\partial^*\qquad} & P_1^* & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Tr}\, A \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & & & & {\scriptstyle p} \searrow \quad \nearrow {\scriptstyle i} & & & \\
 & & & & & \Omega \mathrm{Tr}\, A & & &
\end{array}
\tag{8.2}
$$

Diagram (5.2) now becomes



As a consequence, we have

Proposition 8.4 ([3], Corollary (2.9))**.** *If A is a finitely presented right Λ-module, then*

$$A \overrightarrow{\otimes} _ \simeq \operatorname{Ext}^1(\operatorname{Tr} A, _),$$

with the top row of the preceding diagram giving a projective resolution of $A \overrightarrow{\otimes} _$. Specializing the rightmost column to the Λ-component, we have $A \overrightarrow{\otimes} \Lambda = \operatorname{Ker} \mu_\Lambda$, where $\mu_\Lambda = e_A : A \to A^{**}$ is the canonical evaluation map. □

Remark 8.5. For future use we make a simple observation that the injective stabilization of the tensor product is in fact a bifunctor. This follows from the fact that the tensor product is a bifunctor and a standard diagram chase.

9. The small functor category and the colimit extension

Proposition 8.4 shows that restriction of additive functors to finitely presented modules provides additional insights. In this section, we shall take a closer look at this phenomenon.

The full subcategory of right modules over Λ determined by `finitely presented` modules will be denoted by $\operatorname{mod}(\Lambda)$. The category of all additive functors $F : \operatorname{mod}(\Lambda) \to \operatorname{Ab}$ together with natural transformations between them will be denoted by $(\operatorname{mod}(\Lambda), \operatorname{Ab})$. This is an abelian category, a sequence of natural transformations being exact if and only if it is exact at each component. Gruson and Jensen establish in [11] that $(\operatorname{mod}(\Lambda), \operatorname{Ab})$ is a Grothendieck category; in particular, it has enough injectives. They also show that the injectives are precisely the functors of the form $_ \otimes M$, where M is a pure injective left module. This yields

Proposition 9.1. *Any additive functor $F : \operatorname{mod}(\Lambda) \to \operatorname{Ab}$ commutes with filtered colimits and coproducts.*

Proof. Taking an injective copresentation

$$0 \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow _ \otimes M \xrightarrow{\alpha} _ \otimes N \tag{9.1}$$

of F, we have the desired result because the colimit is an exact functor and the tensor product functor commutes with filtered colimits and coproducts. □

This observation has an important consequence. We shall now show that any functor $F : \mathrm{mod}(\Lambda) \to \mathrm{Ab}$ can be extended to a unique functor $\overrightarrow{F} : \mathrm{Mod}\,(\Lambda) \to \mathrm{Ab}$ on the entire module category, which commutes with filtered colimits. This can be done as follows. First, assume that $F = _ \otimes M$ for some left module M. If $A \in \mathrm{Mod}\,(\Lambda)$ is an arbitrary right module, set $\overrightarrow{F}(A) := A \otimes M$. If $f : A \to B$ is a morphism in $\mathrm{Mod}\,(\Lambda)$, set $\overrightarrow{F}(f) := f \otimes M$. Clearly, $\overrightarrow{F}$ is a functor. The uniqueness of $\overrightarrow{F}$ follows from the two well-known facts: any module can be represented as a filtered colimit of finitely presented modules and the tensor product functor commutes with filtered colimits. This construction shows that if F is the tensor product functor, then $\overrightarrow{F}(A) \simeq \varinjlim F(A_i)$, where $A = \varinjlim A_i$ is a representation of the right Λ-module A as a filtered colimit of finitely presented modules. Before passing to the general case, we also want to define extensions of natural transformations between tensor product functors with pure injective arguments. Let $\alpha : _ \otimes M \longrightarrow _ \otimes N$ be such a transformation with M and N pure injective. By [11, Proposition 1.3],

$$\mathrm{Ext}^n(_ \otimes M, _ \otimes N) \simeq \mathrm{Pext}^n_\Lambda(M, N)$$

where $\mathrm{Pext}^n_\Lambda(M, N)$ is the nth homology group of the complex $\mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(M, Q(N))$, with $Q(N)$ being a pure injective resolution of N. Specializing to the case $n = 0$ and using the fact that N is pure injective by assumption, we have

$$\mathrm{Hom}\,(_ \otimes M, _ \otimes N) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(M, N)$$

In view of this, $\alpha = _ \otimes f$ for some $f : M \to N$. We can now define the desired extension

$$\overrightarrow{\alpha} : _ \overrightarrow{\otimes} M \longrightarrow _ \overrightarrow{\otimes} N$$

of α by setting $\overrightarrow{\alpha} := _ \otimes f$. Since the tensor product is a bifunctor, $\overrightarrow{\alpha}$ is clearly a natural transformation. We remark that, once the injective copresentation (9.1) has been chosen, the extension of α becomes unique. We also notice that if $A = \varinjlim A_i$ is an arbitrary right Λ-module represented as a filtered colimit of finitely presented modules, then for each A_i we have a homomorphism $\alpha_{A_i} : A_i \otimes M \to A_i \otimes N$. Passing to the colimits, we have $\overrightarrow{\alpha}_A = \varinjlim \alpha_{A_i}$.

Now let $F : \mathrm{mod}(\Lambda) \to \mathrm{Ab}$ be an arbitrary additive functor, with injective copresentation (9.1). Define $\overrightarrow{F}$ by the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \overrightarrow{F} \longrightarrow _ \overrightarrow{\otimes} M \xrightarrow{\overrightarrow{\alpha}} _ \overrightarrow{\otimes} N$$

Notice first the foregoing argument for the tensor product shows that the choice of the injective copresentation of F determines $\overrightarrow{F}$ uniquely. Thus, to show that $\overrightarrow{F}$ is unique, it remains to show that any other choice of the injective copresentation of F yields the same $\overrightarrow{F}$. To prove this, we recall the basic fact that any two injective resolutions are homotopy equivalent. Any homotopy, being a natural transformation between tensor products with pure injective arguments arises from a homomorphism between those arguments. This implies that the original homotopy

extends to a homotopy. Since $\overrightarrow{F}$ is defined as the zeroth homology group, we have the desired uniqueness.

Definition 9.2. *The functor $\overrightarrow{F}$ will be called the colimit extension of F.*

The following known result is now obvious.

Theorem 9.3. *The colimit extension $\overrightarrow{F}$ of F is the unique functor on* $\operatorname{Mod}(\Lambda)$ *that commutes with filtered colimits and agrees with F when restricted to* $\operatorname{mod}(\Lambda)$. *Moreover, colimit extension is an equivalence between the small functor category* $(\operatorname{mod}(\Lambda), \mathrm{Ab})$ *and the category of all functors $F : \operatorname{Mod}(\Lambda) \to \mathrm{Ab}$ which commute with filtered colimits, the quasi-inverse provided by the restriction to finitely presented modules.* □

As a result, we have an alternative description of the small functor category: any functor $F \in (\operatorname{mod}(\Lambda), \mathrm{Ab})$ can be identified with its extension $\overrightarrow{F} : \operatorname{Mod}(\Lambda) \to \mathrm{Ab}$, and any functor $F : \operatorname{Mod}(\Lambda) \to \mathrm{Ab}$ that commutes with filtered colimits can be identified, via its restriction, with the corresponding functor in $(\operatorname{mod}(\Lambda), \mathrm{Ab})$. Because both points of view have advantages, we will freely move between the two.

Example 9.4. Any functor on the large module category commuting with filtered colimits is the colimit extension of its restriction. In particular, the colimit extension of the tensor product $_ \otimes B$ is the same tensor product applied to all right modules.

Corollary 9.5. *Any functor $F : \operatorname{Mod}(\Lambda) \to \mathrm{Ab}$ that commutes with filtered colimits also commutes with coproducts.*

Proof. If $F : \operatorname{Mod}(\Lambda) \to \mathrm{Ab}$ commutes with filtered colimits, then it is the extension of its restriction. Since its restriction $F \in (\operatorname{mod}(\Lambda), \mathrm{Ab})$ has injective copresentation

$$0 \to F \to _ \otimes M \to _ \otimes N$$

and since extending this exact sequence results in an exact sequence of functors on $\operatorname{Mod}(\Lambda)$

$$0 \to F \to _ \otimes M \to _ \otimes N$$

the functor F can be viewed as a kernel of a natural transformation between tensor functors. Since the tensor product functor commutes with coproducts and coproducts are exact, the result follows. □

The next proposition provides a nontrivial example of colimit extension.

Proposition 9.6. *Let B be a left module and $A = \varinjlim A_i$ a right module expressed as a filtered colimit of finitely presented modules. Then*

$$(_ \overrightarrow{\otimes} B)(A) \simeq \varinjlim \operatorname{Ext}^1(\operatorname{Tr}(A_i), B)$$

Proof. Since $_ \overrightarrow{\otimes} B$ commutes with filtered colimits, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(_ \overrightarrow{\otimes} B)(A) &\simeq (_ \overrightarrow{\otimes} B)(\varinjlim A_i) \\
&\simeq \varinjlim (_ \overrightarrow{\otimes} B)(A_i) \\
&\simeq \varinjlim (A_i \overrightarrow{\otimes} B) \\
&\simeq \varinjlim \operatorname{Ext}^1(\operatorname{Tr}(A_i), B)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last isomorphism follows from the fact that $A_i \overrightarrow{\otimes} B \simeq \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathrm{Tr}\,(A_i), B)$ for any finitely presented module A_i, as discussed in Proposition 8.4. □

Example 9.7. In [12], Herzog studies a torsion theory on the functor category $(\mathrm{mod}(\Lambda), \mathrm{Ab})$. There he defines for any functor $F \in (\mathrm{mod}(\Lambda), \mathrm{Ab})$ its torsion subfunctor $t(F)$. In particular, his torsion subfunctor $t(_ \otimes B)$ of $_ \otimes B$ is described by

$$t(_ \otimes B) \simeq \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathrm{Tr}\,(_), B)$$

As a result, $_ \overrightarrow{\otimes} B \simeq t(_ \otimes B)$ when $_ \overrightarrow{\otimes} B$ is restricted to the category $\mathrm{mod}(\Lambda)$. Thus, $_ \overrightarrow{\otimes} B$ is the colimit extension of Herzog's torsion functor $t(_ \otimes B)$.

Next, we want to show how the notion of colimit extension leads to a generalization of a theorem of Eilenberg and Watts.

The evaluation functor

$$\mathrm{ev}_\Lambda : (\mathrm{mod}(\Lambda), \mathrm{Ab}) \to \mathrm{Mod}\,(\Lambda^{op})$$

is defined by

$$\mathrm{ev}_\Lambda(F) := F(\Lambda)$$

This functor is exact and, by Proposition 9.1 and Corollary 9.5, it vanishes precisely on those functors $F : \mathrm{mod}(\Lambda) \to \mathrm{Ab}$ which vanish on all projectives in $\mathrm{mod}(\Lambda)$. It was shown in [11] that the functor

$$\epsilon : \mathrm{Mod}\,(\Lambda^{op}) \to (\mathrm{mod}(\Lambda), \mathrm{Ab}) : M \mapsto _ \otimes M \tag{9.2}$$

is an embedding and is left adjoint to ev_Λ. It turns out that the functor ev_Λ has also a right adjoint, $R^0\epsilon$, and both adjoints are fully faithful. Symbolically,

$$(\mathrm{mod}(\Lambda), \mathrm{Ab}) \underset{R^0\epsilon}{\overset{\mathrm{ev}_\Lambda}{\underset{\epsilon}{\rightleftarrows}}} \mathrm{Mod}\,(\Lambda^{op})$$

By [7, Lemma 10], for any functor $F : \mathrm{mod}(\Lambda) \to \mathrm{Ab}$, the adjunction $\epsilon \dashv \mathrm{ev}_\Lambda$ gives rise to a 4-term exact sequence

$$0 \to F^1 \to _ \otimes F(\Lambda) \to F \to F^0 \to 0 \tag{9.3}$$

where the morphism $_ \otimes F(\Lambda) \to F$ is the counit of adjunction and that counit evaluates to an isomorphism on Λ. By Corollary 9.5, it evaluates to an isomorphism on any free module, and therefore on any projective module. Since all functors in this sequence can be viewed as functors on $\mathrm{Mod}\,(\Lambda)$ which commute with filtered colimits and coproducts, we have a generalization of a theorem of Eilenberg and Watts.

Proposition 9.8. *Suppose that an additive functor $F : \mathrm{Mod}\,(\Lambda) \to \mathrm{Ab}$ commutes with filtered colimits. Then*

$$L_0F \simeq _ \otimes F(\Lambda)$$

If F is right-exact, then $F \simeq _ \otimes F(\Lambda)$

Proof. The first assertion follows from the characterization of L_0F as the unique right-exact functor admitting a natural transformation to F which evaluates to an isomorphism on each projective [3, p. 14].

If F is right-exact, then $F \simeq L_0F$, which proves the second assertion. □

The exact sequence (9.3) yields another useful result.

Proposition 9.9. *Both F^0 and F^1 evaluate to zero on any projective, and the exact sequence*

$$0 \to F^1 \to _ \otimes F(\Lambda) \to F \to F^0 \to 0$$

is the projective stabilization sequence for F [3, Definition (1.2), p.15]. *In particular, $F^0 \simeq \underline{F}$.* □

Finally, we want to examine the asymptotic stabilization of the tensor product when Λ is an algebra over a commutative ring R. Choose an injective R-module $\mathbf{J}$ and let $D_{\mathbf{J}} := \operatorname{Hom}_R(_, \mathbf{J})$. Define the functor Hom modulo injectives by setting

$$\overline{\operatorname{Hom}}(X, Y) := \operatorname{Hom}(X, Y)/I(X, Y)$$

where $I(X, Y)$ denotes the subgroup of all homomorphisms factoring through injective modules. We now have

Proposition 9.10. *Let A be a right Λ-module and B a left Λ-module. There is an isomorphism*

$$D_{\mathbf{J}}(A \mathbin{\overrightarrow{\otimes}} B) \simeq \overline{\operatorname{Hom}}(B, D_{\mathbf{J}}(A)),$$

functorial in A and B.

Proof. Let $0 \to B \to I$ be the injective envelope of B. Applying the exact functor D to the defining sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A \mathbin{\overrightarrow{\otimes}} B \longrightarrow A \otimes B \longrightarrow A \otimes I$$

we have the exact sequence

$$(A \otimes I, \mathbf{J}) \longrightarrow (A \otimes B, \mathbf{J}) \longrightarrow (A \mathbin{\overrightarrow{\otimes}} B, \mathbf{J}) \longrightarrow 0$$

By the adjoint property of the tensor product and Hom, this rewrites as

$$(I, D_{\mathbf{J}}(A)) \longrightarrow (B, D_{\mathbf{J}}(A)) \longrightarrow \overline{\operatorname{Hom}}(B, D_{\mathbf{J}}(A)) \longrightarrow 0$$

Comparing the rightmost terms, we have the desired result. □

Remark 9.11. Suppose now that the module A from Proposition 9.10 is finitely presented. Then, up to projective equivalence, A can be written as $\operatorname{Tr} A'$ for some left Λ-module A'. Since tensoring with a projective is an exact functor, the value of the injective stabilization $(\operatorname{Tr} A') \mathbin{\overrightarrow{\otimes}} B$ is well-defined. Also, since $D_{\mathbf{J}}$ converts projectives into injectives, the module $D_{\mathbf{J}}(A)$ is defined uniquely modulo injectives. Together with Proposition 8.4, this yields a well-defined natural isomorphism

$$D_{\mathbf{J}} \operatorname{Ext}^1(A', B) \simeq \overline{\operatorname{Hom}}(B, D_{\mathbf{J}} \operatorname{Tr} A')$$

which is nothing but the Auslander-Reiten formula [4]. Notice however that the Auslander-Reiten formula requires that the contravariant argument of the Ext functor be finitely presented. Thus Proposition 9.10 can be viewed as an extension of the Auslander-Reiten formula to arbitrary modules.

References

[1] M. Auslander. *Coherent functors*. In *Proc. Conf. Categorical Algebra (La Jolla, Calif., 1965)*, pages 189–231. Springer, New York, 1966.

[2] M. Auslander. A functorial approach to representation theory. In *Representations of algebras (Puebla, 1980)*, volume 944 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 105–179. Springer, Berlin-New York, 1982.

[3] M. Auslander and M. Bridger. *Stable module theory*. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, No. 94. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1969.

[4] M. Auslander and I. Reiten. Representation theory of Artin algebras. III. Almost split sequences. *Comm. Algebra*, 3:239–294, 1975.

[5] R.-O. Buchweitz. *Maximal Cohen-Macaulay modules and Tate-cohomology over Gorenstein rings*. 1986. Available at: http://hdl.handle.net/1807/16682

[6] H. Cartan and S. Eilenberg. *Homological algebra*. Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1999. With an appendix by David A. Buchsbaum, Reprint of the 1956 original.

[7] S. Dean and J. Russell. Derived recollements and generalised AR formulas. *arXiv:1612.01651*, 2016.

[8] J. Fisher-Palmquist and D. C. Newell. Bifunctors and adjoint pairs. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 155:293–303, 1971.

[9] Y. Geng and N. Ding. Pure hereditary rings. *Comm. Algebra*, 37(6):2127–2141, 2009.

[10] A. Grothendieck. Sur quelques points d'algèbre homologique. *Tôhoku Math. J. (2)*, 9:119–221, 1957.

[11] L. Gruson and C. U. Jensen. Dimensions cohomologiques reliées aux foncteurs $\varprojlim^{(i)}$. In *Paul Dubreil and Marie-Paule Malliavin Algebra Seminar, 33rd Year (Paris, 1980)*, volume 867 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 234–294. Springer, Berlin-New York, 1981.

[12] I. Herzog. Contravariant functors on the category of finitely presented modules. *Israel J. Math.*, 167:347–410, 2008.

[13] B. H. Maddox. Absolutely pure modules. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 18:155–158, 1967.

[14] A. Martsinkovsky and D. Zangurashvili. The stable category of a left hereditary ring. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 219(9):4061–4089, 2015.

[15] E. Matlis. *Torsion-free modules*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago-London, 1972. Chicago Lectures in Mathematics.

[16] C. Megibben. Absolutely pure modules. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 26:561–566, 1970.

[17] J. Russell. Applications of the defect of a finitely presented functor. *J. Algebra*, 465:137–169, 2016.

[18] B. Stenström. Coherent rings and FP-injective modules. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 2:323–329, 1970.

Mathematics Department, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115, USA
E-mail address: alexmart@neu.edu

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, The College of New Jersey, P.O. Box 7718, Ewing, NJ 08628-0718
E-mail address: russelj1@tcnj.edu